

INFORMA**CONFIDENTIAL**RT

25X1A

COUNTRY USSR
SUBJECT Survey of the Broadcasts of the "Voice of America"

DATE DISTR. 13 AUGUST 1948

NO. OF PAGES 1

PLACE ACQUIRED -----

NO. OF ENCLS. (LISTED BELOW)

DATE ACQUIRED -----

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO.

25X1A

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE ACT 50 U.S.C. 31 AND 32 AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED. HOWEVER INFORMATION CONTAINED IN BODY OF THE FORM MAY BE UTILIZED AS DEEMED NECESSARY BY THE RECEIVING AGENCY

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION FOR THE RESEARCH USE OF TRAINED INTELLIGENCE ANALYSTS

SOURCE DOCUMENTARY

25X1X

-end-

CLASSIFICATION **CONFIDENTIAL /US OFFICIALS ONLY**

STATE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NAVY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSRB			DISTRIBUTION				
ARMY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							

CONFIDENTIAL

RESTRICTED

230545

SURVEY OF THE BROADCASTS OF THE "VOICE OF AMERICA" BY A RUSSIAN

FOREWORD

Necessity for anticommunistic Propaganda

The necessity for creating constant organs of anticommunistic propaganda is dictated by the unavoidability of the struggle and by the impossibility of bringing together the two systems; democratic and communist. Collision of these two ideologies is unavoidable inasmuch as peaceful collaboration does not depend on the good will of the democratic system. Communism as a doctrine rejects in principle the possibility of peaceful existence of the two systems and agrees only to periods of armistices, if it is necessary or useful to communism for its preparation for the ultimate struggle.

Lenin in his time said: "Propaganda is the sharpest weapon of communism". Since then the communists irrevocably put this instruction into practice everywhere and always. In the USSR, beginning with the revolution and up to date, propaganda uses the services of everything: press, radio, cinema, art, and so on. Enormous funds are being expended on propaganda. There is a whole army consisting of several tens of thousands of persons of qualified communistic propagandists, i.e. persons who have made propaganda their profession and by means of which they earn their money. Apart from them, people are recruited for propaganda work by way of "voluntary enforcement", to use the concise expression of the Soviet citizens, millions of people who are fulfilling the so-called "public obligation" which they can not directly reject without being suspected of an antisoviet disposition.

The total circulation of the party literature reaches tens of millions of copies per year. One certainly should not come to the conclusion on the basis of this that communistic literature is very popular, and therefore communistic ideas are just as popular. The point is that the majority of these publications go to the state libraries (and there are no other libraries); in other words, these publications are being bought by the government which issued them. A considerable part is being bought by the members of the Communist Party who are obliged to have such literature; the rest, which is inconsiderable, goes on "free sale" and is being forced onto buyers who must take them to get other goods, or who are obliged to take them by other methods, a description of which would take too much room here. Thus is propaganda organized in the USSR. The effect of communistic propaganda outside of the USSR can be seen from the events of the post-war years.

The so-called "Russian Question"

As a matter of fact, the "Russian question" exists only in the minds of the foreigners. Its substance lies in establishing whether communism is a national Russian phenomenon, whether all Russians are communists, and whether consideration should be given to the communist danger or to the Russian danger.

In theory, it is best to refer this question to the communists. I am sorry to say that this is not practiced. Theoreticians and leaders of communism would answer this question as follows: (I am quoting from a Swedish publication) "If Leninism had represented only an implementation of Marxism on the specific soil of Russia, then Leninism would have been purely national and only a national event, purely Russian and only a Russian event. We knew, however, that Leninism is an INTERNATIONAL development, which has its roots in the entire international field and is not only Russian in scope." - (Stalin, "Questions of Leninism", page 10.)

"The third stage (of the revolution) started after the October coup d'etat. The aim was to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in

one

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED
- 2 -

in one country, using it as a starting point for defeat of imperialism in all countries. Revolution overlaps the borders of one single country. The speech of the world revolution has started." (Stalin, "Questions of Leninism", pages 77 and 78).

"At present, all roads lead to communism" - Molotov. Taken from the report of the famous meeting held in memory of the 30th anniversary of the October Revolution.

This is the answer of the person who is today the leader of world communism, the head of the communism-stricken country, and the person on whom more than on any one else today, depends the development of world politics.

Where do most foreigners get their idea of communism as a national Russian development? How is it possible that events which take place in such countries as France and Italy, which have no connection with the slavie countries, are not considered as a direct confirmation of the INTERNATIONAL character of communism?

However, communism has already existed in Russia for 30 years. That means that Russians maintain it, and perhaps it has turned into a typically Russian development and now we should consider it as a Russian danger.

This practical question should be referred to the Russian people as such, however, this is not possible, or almost impossible for obvious reasons: the complete isolation of the Russian people from all of the outside world, the complete absence of freedom of the Russians; all kinds of freedom, freedom of speech, conscience, press and so on, and even the freedom of movement from one place to another in their own country, or freedom of choice of the place of work. Could one say that Russians approve of all that and that they have willingly deprived themselves of all elementary human rights and voluntarily confined themselves to misery and a half-starved existence because they are slaves, which word means for many a person its literary translation: slaves = slaves.

All these so-called "theories" are being invented mainly in order not to admit the only right theory, namely, that the RUSSIAN PEOPLE ARE ENSLAVED AND ARE JUST AS MUCH TERRORIZED BY COMMUNISM AS ANY OTHER PEOPLE OF A COUNTRY TAKEN BY COMMUNISTS.

If the respect towards a people fighting for its liberty due it from public opinion is measured by the degree and the meaning of the sacrifices which this people makes in that fight, then the world will some day learn the truth about the years of the communist domination in Russia and the suffering of the people, and will pay a tribute due to the peoples of Russia.

I consider it most important to interpret rightly the Russian question and to present it in the right propaganda light in order to achieve the possibility of a successful fight with communism in general and with communism in the USSR in particular, and to influence the issue of the future conflict.

For the issue of this conflict, it can not be a matter of indifference to the democracies which side the Russians are going to take, as it can not be a matter of indifference to the Russians whether the democracies will act with full cognizance of how the painful question of the USSR - Russia should be solved and whether the Russians will be forced to defend Russia, and thus, perhaps, defend communism, as happened in the last war when there was no other way out.

I therefore take it for granted that in the matter of the right kind of policy in the Russian question and particularly in the matter of anticommunistic propaganda in the Russian language that: DEMOCRACIES understand that Russia is enslaved by communism; that the true aspirations and aims of the Russians have nothing in common with the tasks of the Communist Government; that the great majority of the Russians are disposed against the communists; that Russians love freedom as much as any other people, that they wish to live without misery and fear and to take care of their own internal affairs and not to provoke world revolutions.

RESTRICTEDRussians

RESTRICTED

Russians understand that the democracies are fighting only against communism and the USSR and not the Russians and Russia.

Only on this basis, the democracies and the Russians may become, and should become, allies in the common fight against communism. In order to reach such mutual understanding, these questions must be made completely clear and there should be consistency in their actions. Touching upon the activity of the VA ("Voice of America"), I wish to bring all the above into relation with its work.

If the main task at the present time is to weaken the enemy, then it could best be weakened by internal propaganda, directed towards a moral isolation of the Communist Party and the Government from the Russian people, and towards decreasing the possibility of its being used by the communists in the fight against the democracies.

In the course of all the fight, communism and Russian people should be separated. Precisely, it is necessary to distinguish between the conceptions of Russian and Soviet, USSR and Russia, communist policy and Russian policy, Communist Government and Russian Government, communist danger and Russian danger, and so on.

Every totalitarian regime is directed against the people and totalitarian government does not represent the will of the majority of the people. Goebbels, for instance, understood perfectly how dangerous it is in propaganda to separate the totalitarian government from the people which is governed by it. His opinion in this matter is so interesting that I am quoting fully an excerpt from his diary printed in the Swedish paper "Dagens Nyheter" on 10 March 1948:

".....They offer in the U.S.A. a mere subtle propaganda. To stop accusing the German people and to attack only Nazism. I see in that a certain danger. The propaganda of the adversary, fortunately, is not so unanimous and consecutive as to have followed this propaganda method for a long time. If it were otherwise, we would have been facing considerable difficulties at the time of every new crisis. If I were in the place of the adversary, I would have from the first day followed strongly and irrevocably the propaganda about the fact that the struggle is not against the German people but against Nazism. This is how Chamberlain started on the first day of war, but this method was not followed. I would have forbidden transcription in the German press of such expression which appear more and more in the American press. They should not be used even in polemics. Such things should not be mentioned in any case. The German people should be convinced of the fact that this war is hindering their life and their possibilities of national development, and that they must develop all their strength in defense."

This statement is equally applicable to the USSR.

Only such a policy of taking advantage of internal controversies would bring practically useful results. Even with the most simple political foresight and without adhering to a conviction of the innocence of the Russian people in the matter of communism, it would be entirely absurd to use any other propaganda, the result of which would be the unification of the Russian people with communism and the strengthening of the totalitarian regime.

Work of the VA at the present time.

If we follow the broadcasts of the VA from the beginning up to date, we clearly see the changes which have taken place.

From a loyal organ of information of a wide circle of Soviet listeners about the life of America with a view to strengthening friendly relations and the establishment of a closer contact between the people of the two great allied countries, VA has turned into an organ of anticommunist propaganda in the Russian language.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

This development is quite natural, but it is not sufficiently rapid nor consequent nor effective because, in spite of the change of purpose, the character of the work of the VA has remained almost the same.

At the present time, three-fourths of the material used by VA has still for its purpose an objective and exhaustive demonstration of life in America. They count on an expansive circle of listeners, mainly cultured. The tone of the broadcasts is abstract, apolitical and unenergetic. The contents are often ineffective as far as propaganda is concerned.

If such a policy and such a character of broadcasts is a result of carefully elaborated choice, then it is an error in principle.

If such results are unintentional, then it is evident that concrete purpose is absent, and there appears to be ignorance of the actual circle of listeners, its composition, its interests and requirements.

If they have started turning VA into an organ of anticommunistic propaganda, this should be brought to a logical end.

The broadcasts of VA lag behind the policy of the U.S.A. An overall aggression should be started here as well.

The concrete purpose of the broadcasts of VA must be the strengthening of an anticommunistic disposition in the USSR.

The VA should not for one instant be used for anything but propaganda and making VA popular among Soviet listeners.

From this point of view, I start with the survey of the broadcasts of VA and submit my proposals.

SURVEY OF BROADCASTS OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Who listens to VA in the USSR?

The notion that Bolsheviks will permit free listening to the broadcasts of VA, or that they will be listened to by a person who is loyal to the Soviet Government, is entirely wrong.

The entire Soviet propaganda serves one and only one purpose: to prove that the Soviet citizen lives better and more freely than a citizen of any other country, and that the Soviet Government has undoubted advantages over democratic government.

This propaganda is being carried on uninterruptedly and cunningly. One of the methods of its implementation is the dissemination of misrepresentations about democratic countries, compilation of facts and events, direct lies, and the exclusion of any possibility of criticism of the Soviet methods inside the USSR.

Being aware, however, that all the "results" achieved would amount to nothing, if the Soviet citizen had a chance to control and to compare, the Bolsheviks are trying to isolate hermetically all Russians from the outside world.

The VA broadcasts make a hole in this wall of lies and isolation. Therefore, the mere fact of the existence of VA, even if its broadcasts were completely neutral, and were only to represent real life in America, is a fact undesirable to the Bolsheviks. Inasmuch as the broadcasts of the VA are more and more daring, the Bolsheviks consider VA as a direct danger.

To the deepest regret of the Bolsheviks, they cannot forbid the U.S.A. to make such broadcasts, but they can and will fight it in another manner available to them: by using direct and indirect repression against such

RESTRICTED

- 5 -

RESTRICTED

Soviet citizens who listen to the broadcasts of the VA. We had examples of this in the past, when the most cruel repressions were applied to people who were either caught, or reported as listening to anti-Soviet broadcasts of foreign broadcasting stations, or to the portable broadcasting stations of the underground anticommunistic movement inside the USSR.

There is a good example of how the Bolsheviks are afraid of the slightest criticism and any appearance of anticommunistic disposition. The Soviets issued in 1935 or 1936 a law which states that a person who relates anti-Soviet anecdotes is to be imprisoned in a concentration camp for a term up to 5 years.

I can with full right say that three-quarters of the regular listeners to VA in the USSR are persons who are anticommunistically disposed, the enemies of Bolshevism, who listen to VA with the risk of punishment by the Soviet Government.

The VA audience is to be found among the most contrasting layers of the population: intelligentsia, workmen, peasants, and even the army.

This audience must be taken into consideration when broadcasts are being created.

In spite of the differences in social status and cultural level, all these people are united by the same feeling of hatred towards the totalitarian communist regime. Therefore, the most crucial error in broadcasting would be to leave out any political influence.

In order to strengthen the anticommunistic trends in the USSR, VA must first of all make use of already existing anticommunistic groups which, in fact, as I already mentioned, comprise three-fourths of the regular audience of the VA.

Every broadcast of VA could be divided into three integral parts: 1) Technical, 2) Musical, and 3) literary-propagandistic. I shall start with the most important third part.

"Literary-Propagandistic" Material of the VA

The composition of VA audiences varies greatly according to their cultural standards. In choosing the subjects, the mediocre listener is to be taken into account, the content should be interesting for all listeners.

VA should not degrade itself by using slang, but without exception the language of all transmissions must be comprehensible to every listener. The language should be simple and contemporary Russian.

At the moment, the language of the VA broadcasts is suffering from longish expressions, sometimes errors, and even un-Russian expressions, as well as from over-emphasized expressions and words of the intelligentsia, especially in the literary and musical sections. Let me give several examples.

In the very beginning of the broadcast: "Good evening... here is the survey of the news of the day....And here.... The greeting "Good evening" is not used by a single one of the Soviet broadcasting stations, nor in the broadcasting of many other European countries, and it has a strange and obsolete *sound* to the ear of the Soviet listener. The expression "here is" in the beginning is in this case a direct translation from a foreign language into Russian.

1st March. Survey of the Day's News: Norwegian student (Norwegian students) should be pronounced norveZSKIJE student - the second E is superfluous and should not be used.

7th April. Second Transmission: "Before the child reaches one year ---" It should be "until one year of age". In the criticism of the opera "Medium", a number of atrocious, un-Russian expressions occurred. (The translator was unable to render these expressions in English.)

There are a number of such examples and I should not take all this

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

space to describe them. The general impression which I have received is a certain obsolescence and negligence of the language, and a needless use of the language of the intelligentsia and of special expressions. VA should try to be clear and easily understood. The most clever and complicated idea can be expressed simply.

The errors of the language could be easily done away with and present no danger. Considerably greater errors are in the very direction of the material. Let me give two examples.

15th April, Discourse on the performance of the works of Soviet composers in the U.S.A. This discourse concerned the works of Hrennikoff and his First Symphony:

Any manifestation of free artistic work is persecuted in the USSR. It is known that OKVPb recently attacked the Soviet composers claiming that they are anti-nationalistic and full of bourgeois ideas, that they admire the art of the West. They were ordered to modify their work and to limit it to the tasks of the Communist Party ideology. Such accusations seem to be ridiculous and monstrous nonsense in the U.S.A., but are a tragedy in the USSR.

It would definitely seem that the commentator of the VA should speak drastically about the communistic violence and Soviet propaganda, defending the rights of Russian composers to personal freedom and freedom of work, pointing out all the leanness and stupidity of the Soviet criticism, proving that what was created by the composers in freedom, and condemned by Soviet propaganda, is the best and the most talented, and that the quality of the work gets worse and worse when the composers must comply with the requirements of communistic terrorists. The VA should present and analyse the best and the most talented works of the Soviet composers who are condemned by the Soviet Government.

What is the author of the VA discourse doing? Here are the expressions which he uses in referring to Hrennikoff's work: "Only the conservative critics of America appreciate it....it is small-bourgeois....naive...superficial...there is no glamour and no depth...there is only a certain attraction because of imitation of the old samples of bourgeois art...." and so on in the same spirit.

Such criticism would be gladly accepted by the propaganda section of OKVPb, which would even be glad to borrow some of the expressions from the author of the discourse.

The discourse leaves the impression that its author speaks against the condemned Russian composers and in defense and support of Soviet propaganda. The Soviet audience will get the idea from this discourse that, apparently, Soviet propaganda is right and is correctly criticising contemporary Russian composers, if even in America the criticism is word for word like the Soviet criticism.

Many of the items of the VA broadcasting are to me colorless and apolitical, but such broadcasting is downright dangerous, and favorable to Soviet propaganda.

Let us suppose that the author of the discourse could not possibly say anything else about Hrennikov because such is his point of view. Then I should like to know why he chose Hrennikov for his subject. Was it not possible for him to take another contemporary Soviet composer and to start actual propaganda material in the right way. Let us even suppose that the author cannot say anything good about any Soviet composers who are condemned by the Soviet Government; then he should not criticise so drastically decent people, thus helping Soviet propaganda. He would have done better had he directed his blow and his criticism against the communist followers, untalented people who make their career singing about Stalin, and whom Soviet propaganda advertises and supports so strongly.

10th April, a discourse dedicated to the daily paper "News Herald Tribune" in the section on literature and art;

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

This broadcast was even more dangerous than the one mentioned above. The commentator, taking advantage of this opportunity, talks about the contemporary Russian question to which I referred. He does not come to any conclusions and does not inform us of his point of view directly, but by analogy he compares the USSR and RUSSIA, communistic aspirations and "the same old Russian imperialism". Soviet citizens get a very definite idea that the commentator in talking about Karl Marx and saying that "Karl Marx was an enemy of Slavs in general and of Russians in particular", is himself disposed likewise and is transferring his convictions to the present.

In quoting Karl Marx to the effect that "The question is that either the Slavs will conquer Europe or it will be necessary to destroy Russia", it appears that he believes in it himself.

Perhaps it is only lack of ability to take advantage of the material, or perhaps such are the personal convictions of the commentator, but the fact should not be forgotten that the Soviet listener considers VA not as an organ for transmitting the personal views of individuals, but as a voice of the people and the Government of the U.S.A., as the voice of its public opinion. Not for nothing is this broadcast called the Voice of the United States of America.

Confusion, the feeling that Americans in no way understand the position of the Russian people, as well as a feeling of scorn and of being insulted in their national dignity are the result of such broadcasting. This is not the result that VA expects. The propaganda of VA should not tend to antagonize the Russians and turn them against America. In order to wage a successful fight against communism, it is better not to make any propaganda in Russian, if it leads to a feeling of cooperation between Russians and communism.

All these excerpts from Karl Marx, all this excellent propaganda material, should be used in order to dethrone the worship of Karl Marx in the USSR and to throw some light on the views of the "founder of communism" towards Russia, from a completely new point of view, unknown to the Soviet listener, creating in the audience a feeling of hatred and contempt for the theory of communism and its followers in the USSR today. That direct aim should have been taken when Karl Marx was cited. It should have been stated clearly, and no room left for doubt should have been left which might lead to possible misunderstanding. In this case, the broadcast was dangerous.

Without mentioning the fact that the precious time of the VA broadcasts should not be wasted, I wish to emphasize that the Russian listener should not be given programs for his entertainment only; the best entertainment for a Russian and his greatest pleasure is to listen to criticism of the Soviet regime, to antisoviet propaganda.

Examples of uninteresting and aimless transmissions are:

Sensational news about a sailor whose life was saved	March 1
Easter parade of clothes on Fifth Avenue	" 31
Digest of the novel "Ideas of March"	April 3
Equipment of a nursery	" 7
Tale for children "Present from St. Nicholas"	" 14

as well as many others.

The time wasted for the above should have been used in a more practical way. Apart from such empty material, the rest of the material is not being used, or almost not used, for direct propaganda, and therefore becomes apolitical.

In its propaganda work VA must take advantage of, and use against Communism, its own very effective tactics: instead of trying to defend passively the democratic system, VA should attack through active criticism of communism and Soviet authority, and point out its faults. Material for that lies in the present life in the USSR, in its laws, its order, internal and external politics, press, literature, art, technique, organization, and so on.

Thus, the blow should be aimed at the USSR, and demonstration of American life should be turned into material which is illustrative of such criticism.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

Methods of criticism should be first of all methods of direct comparison, concrete facts and direct revelations. Let me approach the VA broadcasts from this point of view.

In the section of the economic review of life in America on April 2nd, a discourse was started and continued in some other transmission about taxation in America. The speaker limited the discourse to a dry statement of a progressive taxation system and to a statement of the corresponding figures. In one place, it is true, the speaker, having touched upon the question of the refusal of Czechoslovakia, Poland and other countries under communist influence to participate in the Marshall plan, stated that "they have suddenly, as though under the influence of some outer force, refused to participate in the rehabilitation of Europe". I must comment on this expression.

The fact is, that the "diplomatic" expressions, so often used in broadcasting such as "a certain state, a certain country, a certain force which is backing...", and so on, are being used with a caution not always justified and sound absurd. It is so much more absurd, because the papers and political leaders have long since been calling things by the names that belong to them. Such expressions in the broadcasts of the VA can raise amid the Soviet audience a notion of a certain fear and a desire not to insult the representatives of the dominant totalitarianism.

If, due to serious diplomatic reasons, direct reference to the Soviet Government should be avoided, I recommend the use in such cases of the expression "Bolsheviks". Bolsheviks is a purely historical expression given to Russian communists by themselves, after the party split, so as to segregate definitely followers of Lenin from the smaller part of "Mensheviks". Since under the name of Bolsheviks only Russian Communists (the VKPb, meaning the All-Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks) are meant, when it is used there cannot be any doubt that the Soviet Communists are meant, or the Soviet Government and institutions. That is how it is understood by the Soviet radio listeners.

I come back now to the discourse about taxation. How could this subject be used for propaganda purposes? The entire material should be presented as a direct refutation of Soviet propaganda and polemics about it. Not only the sense of the discourse, which the listener must often guess, but also the text itself should state that: "Bolshevik propaganda is trying to convince its audience that in America the law defends only the interests of the rich. Let us see how things in fact are. Let us, for instance, take such an important question as taxation."

Here, the author, having stated the figures and having made the analysis of the law should give his comments: "The democratic system of the U.S.A. first of all defends the interests of the people. Progressive taxation and the figures which we have set forth serve as the best refutation of the propaganda which purposely distorts the actual state of things in America."

In another part of the same report the author considers the question of the system of super-taxation on extra income introduced in the U.S.A. during the war. Here also the author limited himself only to the statement that this super tax represented 95% of the extra income. He made this statement in a completely calm, dispassionate voice, without the slightest effort to make use of this fact for propaganda purposes.

This law should have been represented about as follows: "95% of the extra income of private enterprises which is due to the increase of their production on account of war orders, was taken into the state treasury of the U.S.A. From there it went to create a war might capable of fighting Nazian and of defending freedom. From there, this money went for military and material assistance to the USSR which during the war represented about 11 billions of dollars, or about one-half of the sum which is foreseen by the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of all Europe in the course of five years. Thus, the American people have used for the aims of freedom the very extra profit about which communistic propaganda cries so often. What is left of its statement that the American people shed its blood for the sake of extra income for the capitalists?"

As all

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

As all the rest of it, so this also is a deliberate misrepresentation of truth in order to make the communist theories seem true."

The method of direct comparison and refutation should be used wherever possible. As little as possible of commonplaces, and more concrete examples. This is a simpler way of persuading the audience. For example, instead of wasting time on a description of the history and development of some paper, and using commonplace expressions about the freedom of the press in America, the material should be used according to other principles: "We leave it to our listeners to get a notion about the actual freedom of the press in America. Let us take, for instance, some politically thrilling news and let us see how it is being commented upon by different newspapers."

Then should follow the comments on the question in various papers including the left and communist papers. Then a deduction should be made as follows: "You see for yourself, that the freedom to express opinions and freedom of the press is actually complete in America. The communist press can express its opinions openly. It has every possibility to disseminate freely its convictions and to attempt to win the confidence of the American people. Why is it not popular? Why is its circulation only about one tenth of the circulation of only one liberal newspaper? Nobody can force a free American to buy the liberal paper. He can as easily buy a communist paper, if he so wishes. The communist press is not popular because the American people, having the possibility of a free choice, does not approve of the communist totalitarian system. American workmen, according to a communist expression "class brothers" of the Russian worker, and not some capitalist and reactionary, knows through the experience of bolshevik-conquered countries what pathetic results for the people come with the victory of communism."

If the political convictions and sympathies of the American people can easily be determined by what papers it reads and supports, it is not possible to do so in the USSR. There all the press is operated by the Bolsheviks and the people have no chance to talk freely. It would be interesting to note that the peoples of Russia really think about communism, if they were for only one day to have the right to express their thoughts freely, without fear of repressions and consequences.

If the Soviet propaganda insists that all American magazines are trivial, full of detective subjects and obscurities, then VA should not bring out the history of such magazines but should quote individual articles on various questions which are interesting and essential so that the Soviet listener could get the idea of the actual standard of the magazines. By this method it is easiest to refute Soviet propaganda and to convince the listeners. Such readings should be done not once in a while, but often.

A thorough track should be kept of the Soviet press and broadcasts, and every chance and excuse should be taken and used, every misstep of Soviet propaganda used for immediate attack. Such chances and possibilities are offered by Soviet propaganda in enormous quantities every day.

For instance, quite recently the Soviet radio informed its hearers about the "new remarkable success of the Soviet science and of the invention by a Soviet scientist of bulbs of electric 'daylight'". The entire tendency of this broadcast was in the usual tone of Soviet propaganda. "This problem was elaborated and worked upon during many years by the entire scientific-research institute, under its deeply respected head academician Vaviloff - who was the direct inventor 'whose name is known to the whole civilized world'." It was also pointed out that "such brilliant success in technique and science is only possible under the Soviet Government". A promise was made that the bulbs of "daylight" will soon be used in "schools and clubs, theatres and hospitals", etc. Not a word was said that this "invention" was invented long ago and that the "daylight" was known long ago and is being widely used in the majority of countries.

Thus Soviet propaganda creates in the minds of Soviet citizens an impression of the "incredible achievements of Soviet technique and science" for which only the Soviet Government is to be thanked. This last statement is always strongly emphasized. Many Soviet citizens believe in this quite faithfully, and even the anticommunists find a certain explanation and excuse in it for the misery and starvation in the

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

USSR.

It would seem that VA should make a revelation on this point, and drag into the light the Bolshevik bluffing. Instead of that, in the section on American technical accomplishments, are recorded colorless reports about the "success and achievements of American house building" in which the speaker during fifteen minutes or so included an enormous quantity of miscellaneous material, "having touched upon everything only lightly, but with a scientific air".

(The following paragraph is on page 11)

Material

RESTRICTED

Material for broadcasting is to be made so concrete, and so convenient and so well founded, that the anticommunist Russian listener could use it without difficulty in making propaganda against the Soviet Government and for the democracies.

Whenever possible, it should be accompanied by reference to sources, statistical data and figures. One should not forget that the Soviet citizen is brought up on figures: he respects them and they serve as the best possible proof to him. However these figures should be communicated in a convenient and easy-to-remember way and not, for example, in the way it was done in one of the transmissions of the VA when statistics of the food consumption of one American was recorded. Only average annual figures were given. These figures are not easy to remember and there is no time to jot them down. Apart from that, it is doubtful that any one of the listeners ever reckoned how much bread he eats and how much butter, sugar etc., during one year. Therefore these figures could not have any definite effect.

Instead of that, the figures showing a weekly ration of the average American should be given. The weekly ration of an average person is known to the majority of the audience of VA, and they can immediately make a comparison. Figures so presented are effective and easy to remember.

A short and simple resumé should be given at the end. An average listener must be reckoned with. He should not be left to his own devices and he should not be left to digest independently the material to which he listens, which often deals with complicated matters. It should be remembered that they are only broadcasts and not a printed text which is always at hand and which the listener can at any time and many times read tentatively, reproduce it by memory and make his own conclusions. During the broadcasting the listener can easily forget something or misunderstand or not catch it. The resumé at the end of each important transmission will make it easier for the listener to remember and understand what is broadcast. One should insist that the subject of the broadcast be an easily comprehended matter for the audience.

The tone of the transmission should be definite, sharp if necessary, and always polemic. A polemical tone leaves a vivid and a continuing impression. Not only the mind of the listener should be attracted, but he must also be very much interested in the discussion of the given subject. Sometimes you should refer directly to the listener, asking him to verify and to compare what is said with Soviet data or figures in such a way that he has time to jot things down.

The speech of the representative of the USA at the conference on the press and freedom of information in Geneva - Mr. Benson, transmitted by VA, represents an excellent example of the tone and language in which all the transmissions of VA should be given.

The method of another representative at the same conference when he denied the statements of Soviet delegates about freedom of the press in the USSR, making use for that purpose of the provisions of the literary and press Board /Glavlit/, represents an excellent example of the method which should be used in VA.

Data on the status of the average American workman, employee, professional worker, their wages, material possibilities, prices of goods and merchandise in comparison with the buying capacity, and other everyday details should be repeated in the transmissions

as often

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

as often as convenient.

The broadcast referring to labor legislation (wages, wages, compensation for accidents or sickness, vacations, leaves, etc.) to questions of education, medical service, insurance, status of women, to the system of acquiring merchandise on installment payments, and other important questions should be broadened and transmitted a number of times even at the cost of other less important material. It is better to decrease the extensive scope of different questions dealt with by VA and to emphasize the matters which have a considerable propaganda effect and psychological meaning.

Dealing with direct criticism of the Soviet system you should introduce surveys of the Soviet press, economy, art, technique, science, & short stories should be recited touching upon subjects of Soviet life, etc.

It would be very good to start upon a cycle of reports criticizing the theory of Communism and working in this direction to disclose the falsified history of Russia, of the revolution and the Soviet history set forth in the famous "manual" Stalin "History of VKP/b/" (History of the all-Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks).

A part of all the above-mentioned is represented in the broadcast of VA very insignificantly, and many important matters are completely absent.

RESTRICTED

REMARKS ON DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF VA

"Discussions"

Transmission of the latest news is the best organized,

Discourses "representing American life in the form of discussions" - are erroneously entitled as the conception of discussion is absent; that is, a report on various doctrines is being made. A "discussion" in the Soviet sense of the term ensues when all speakers in different voice, and in a different manner continue stating the same thing.

The material which is being used is in most cases not sufficiently interesting. The change of voices, instead of livening the transmission in this form of "discussion", only hampers the listener from concentration on the subject. The very idea of the form of "discussion" is very interesting and there are great possibilities in it, if it is well organized.

Broadcasts about workman's arbitration.

These are very interesting. In the three cases in which I listened the workman always won and the employer always lost. You should be more careful. The Soviet listener could suspect deliberate choice of material and an artificial development of the Court proceedings in the desired direction.

Transmission of the contents of document referring to German-Soviet relationship in 1939 - 1941. This is excellent propaganda material; nothing better could be imagined. It should have been followed by a criticism and denial of the "facts" set forth in the Soviet propaganda book "Falsifiers of History" which was written to fight down the subject which is now being transmitted by VA.

Musical Section.

As in the whole program of VA, the material used in the musical section should aim at one and only one idea. To aid it for the anticommunistic propaganda in the USSR. Every minute of the precious time should be used to the utmost advantage.

The musical section at the present moment does not satisfy these requirements. The material is incidental and uninteresting. It is difficult to see a plan and a purpose in the transmissions. An impression is created that VA has not sufficient material for transmission and that music is introduced to fill the gaps.

The bulk of the program is filled with classical and various western music. For example, during the period of 5 - 15 April we heard the concerts of Bach, Marcello, symphony pieces, music from operas, etc.

This is done at the time when classical and opera music fills the repertoire of Soviet concerts and transmissions. Apart from that the bulk of the listeners, as I emphasized, is

RESTRICTED

composed of extremely different elements according to their cultural standards and their interest in music. Why should the Soviet listeners, or at least two-thirds of them, listen to music which does not interest them? This does not increase the number of listeners.

The fact should also be taken into consideration that the artistic value of the broadcasts is often decreased by atmospheric hindrances and interference and then even the person who appreciates classical music has no pleasure in listening to it.

The greatest mistake is the fact that such broadcasts are devoid of political influence. Very useful are the broadcasts of American music and American composers. These transmissions are necessary. However, they should not be forced upon the Soviet listeners. The VA could not achieve that. The difference between Russian and American music is too essential.

That is where the method of denial should be used. If the Soviet propaganda is sounding in the ears of their listeners that the WHOLE of present American music is neurasthenic, hysterical and cacophonous, it is not wise to try to prove that the compositions on which the Soviet propaganda has based all its statements are not at all hysterical, generalizing and cacophonous, and their subject is not pathological (as in the case of the opera "Medium" by Minotti) in trying to illustrate these proofs by examples of music and subjects which are really beyond the comprehension of the Soviet listener. This could lead only to disagreement with the VA and acknowledgement of the Soviet propaganda. It would be quite sufficient to state that in the free country of America every artist is allowed to create whatever he desires, and if his creations are accepted by the public opinion it means that they have the right to exist. To deny the Soviet propaganda, it would be necessary to broadcast the modern American music in considering the Russian taste, i. e. the music which is composed in a simpler and usual way, comprehending the real, simple and joyful subjects. That would be the easiest way to defeat the Soviet propaganda and to change the impression of the Soviet listener.

The special transmissions of American folk music and songs is indispensable.

Referring to the jazz and dance music in the third transmission I can only say that if the purpose of this transmission is to make the majority of Russian radio-listeners shut their radios off, this is really the best way.

American jazz music is simply unpopular with the majority of Russians. They should not be forced to listen to it. Having the choice of American or European jazz music, for instance Polish or German, the Russian listeners would certainly choose the latter. The listeners, having heard in the third transmission the latest news will either shut the radio off or turn to another station, as soon as the "Program of American dance music" starts. You can be very certain that no one dances to it.

Thus, half of the entire time of the third transmission is being entirely wasted. I recommend that the program of the third transmission dedicated to American dance music be cut out and replaced with other material.

How should the musical section of the VA be changed into the section of propaganda intended to increase the number of listeners? It is a good idea to make them wait for the transmissions of VA and to listen to them, if only in order to listen to their favorite music. It would make them listen to other

RESTRICTED

subjects

subjects transmitted by VA.

The best way would be to transmit Russian music and first of all the music which the Bolsheviks have either forbidden or have indirectly excluded from their repertoire. Why, instead of Bach and Western opera music not make them acquainted with the magnificent Russian church music of such composers as Bartynsky, Turchaninov, Arhangelsky, Grechaninov and others? Why not transmit "Credo" and "Blessed art Thou, Lord" and the other pieces of Tchaikovsky? Two purposes would be thus achieved: the Russian listener would be interested and it would be proved to him that the Bolsheviks have stolen from the Russian people a whole and considerable epoch of their music - church music the very existence of which the new generation does not even suspect.

Transmissions of the old Russian and Gypsy songs should be introduced because Russians are overjoyed with this music when it creeps into the programs of Soviet concerts. I have recently heard a transmission from the USSR of the concert by the choir of Sveshnikov. From the whole repertoire the most applause was given to the song "Swallow" which the choir had to repeat three times.

Give as many of Chaliapin's pieces as possible. He is popular and he is a favorite. Transmit and present as much of the Russian music abroad as possible: the Choir of the Don Cossacks, Affensky's choir and other Russian singers.

Russian music will meet with great success and will produce the required result.

I am not a specialist in music but I consider it my duty to appraise the present musical transmissions from the point of view of the average listener who is to be reckoned with and thus to recommend the above-listed changes.

Technical part

It is absolutely necessary to mention at the end of the second transmission the program of VA for the following day and not to mention it only in the third transmission.

The very wording of the announcement of the VA transmissions should be revised, made shorter, and repetitions should be avoided. Instead of a detailed analysis I give as example a text of the announcement which I suggest replace the present one.

I wish specially to emphasize the absolutely senseless and unpardonable length of a three or four times repeated announcement of some report, review or discussion contained in the transmitted program. It is done in the following way.

In the beginning of the first transmission appears the following announcement:

"In our today's program you will hear the discussion by our musical commentator on the matter of music - Nicholas Nabokoff. The discussion will deal with a review of the opera "Medium" by the contemporary American composer Minetti".

Then in the very beginning of the second transmission: "We begin our second transmission with the review of the American press following which we shall transmit today the discussion by our commentator on the subject of music - Nicholas Nabokoff, dealing with the opera "Medium" by the contemporary American

composer

RESTRICTED

composer Minotti..."

After that before starting the discussion:
"Now follows the regular discussion of music. These discussions are being made on Thursdays by our musical commentator on the subject of music - Nicholas Nabokoff. The today's discussion will deal with the analysis of opera "Medium" by composer Minotti. We are passing the microphone to Nicholas Nabokoff..."

Then follows the "long waited for" discussion at the end of which: "We have transmitted the regular discussion on the subject of music by our commentator Nicholas Nabokoff, in which he analyzed the creation of the contemporary American composer Minotti, and his opera "Medium"... That is the language of the transmission.

Why should that be so? VA is not an advertisement for musical and literary critics. I call that method "a lot of meaningless words". Announcement of the program should be made simple and short. The time thus gained could be used for announcement of the program for the following day which I already mentioned.

I submit the following proposal.

The present method

"Listen, listen, New York speaking. You hear today's first transmission of the "Voice of the United States of America". The time now is 13 hours according to New York time and 18 hours according to Moscow time. The radio program is transmitted every day from New York in the wavelength of 19, 18 and 13 meters and also on the waves 45.34, 31.45, 35.37 and 19.80m. or in frequencies: 6080 kc., 9540 kc., 1170 Kcs and 15150 Kcs. The Voice of the United States of America transmits every day three programs, the first at 21 hours, the second at 21.30 and the third at midnight according to Moscow time. Good evening. Our first transmission starts with the review of news of the day after which we shall transmit..."

"New York speaking. You are listening to the Voice of the United States of America. In our second transmission that you will hear in one minute, will be transmitted..... Our second broadcast will be transmitted on the same wave length as the first one. You will hear us in forty seconds. This program was transmitted from the United States of America....."

Listen, listen, New York speaking. You listen to our second broadcast: "The Voice of the United States of America. It is now 13 hours according

The proposed method

"Listen, listen, New York speaking. The Voice of the United States of America is speaking. It is now 13 hours according to New York time. Listen to our transmissions three times a day: at 21 hours at 21.30 and at midnight according to Moscow time. The transmissions are made from New York on radio waves of 19, 18 and 13 meters, 45.34, 31.45, 35.37 and 19.80 meters or on frequencies 6080, 9540, 11870 Kcs. We start our first transmission. Today's program contains:... We are transmitting the latest news."

"New York speaking. The Voice of the United States of America speaking. Follows the break of one minute. In one minute you will hear on the same wave length our second transmission.

.....

RESTRICTED

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt



RESTRICTED

to the New York time and 11.30 according to the Moscow time. This program is being transmitted every day on the wave length of 19.16 and 13 meters, as well as on the wave length of 49.54, 31.45, 25.37 or in frequencies 6080 Kcs., 9540 Kcs., 11870 Kcs., and 15150 Kcs. We are starting our second transmission after which we shall transmit

"Listen, listen, New York speaking. The Voice of the United States of America speaking. 21 hour and 30 minutes according to the Moscow time. In our second transmission listen to: (brief program)

"New York speaking. You are listening to the transmission of the Voice of the United States of America. Now follows a short review of the daily news.....

"You have listened to our today's second transmission 'The Voice of the United States of America'. Tonight at midnight according to the Moscow time you will hear our third transmission on the wave length of : 49.54, 31.45, 25.37 and 19.16 or in frequencies - 6080 Kcs., 9540 Kcs., 11870 Kcs., and 15150 Kcs. In two hours at midnight according to the Moscow time we shall transmit the full review of the latest news of the day and a program of American Dance Music. You will hear us again at midnight.

New York speaking. Voice of the United States of America speaking. We transmit the short review of the daily news and the program of tomorrow's transmission.New York speaking. The Voice of the United States of America is finishing its second transmission. Listen to us every day three times a day: at 11 hrs., 11.30 and at midnight according to the Moscow time. The transmissions are made from New York under wave length of 49.54, 31.45, 25.37 and 19.16 meters, or in frequencies of 6080, 9540, 11870 and 15150 Kcs. At midnight the Voice of the United States of America will transmit the latest news and ... (concert of old Russian songs, for example). Listen to us at midnight again.

The same remarks are to be taken in consideration in the third transmission. The conclusion of the third transmission should be replaced from "and now we shall wish our listeners in the Soviet Union a very good night" - to "good night, good night! Listen to us tomorrow."

Conclusion.

In conclusion of the whole review of the VA, I wish to state that it could make an impression of a too sharp denial of all the good features in the transmissions of VA. It is not so. I fully acknowledge the merits of the transmissions from VA which are accomplishing a very big and important task, and doing it very often not badly at all.

I beg you to consider my criticism as a friendly criticism, the only intention of which is to help to make the transmissions of the VA most effective in the struggle with Communism in the USSR.

In some cases, the authoritative tone of my remarks could be explained by a deep knowledge of actual contemporary Soviet life in which I was born and brought up.

RESTRICTED